REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-16 remain pending in the application. By this Amendment claims 1, 5, 7, 11 and 14 are amended. Claim 5 inserts a colon after "comprising". No new matter is added.

Applicant's representative would like to thank Examiner Nathan Hillery for the clarification provided during the brief telephone discussion held on June 4, 2008. During the telephone discussion, Examiner Hillery clarified that the final Office Action is responsive to the Applicant's Response of December 11, 2007; and that paragraph 3 of the final Office Action contains an erroneous text referring to a request for continued examination. Accordingly, based on the clarification received, Applicants respond to the final Office Action dated April 4, 2008.

In numbered paragraphs 5-10, pages 2-9 of the final Office Action, claims 1-4 and 7-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over the Examiner's cited Ecolore screen shots and source codes: glossaries.xml, glossaries_en.xml, glossaries_el.xml, glossaries.xml?lang=en, glossaries.xml?lang=el; source: July 2003 WaybackMachine printouts of Ecolore website "ecolore.leeds.ac.uk/xml/links/glossaries.xml"; in view of JP 2001-290812 (GK Associates KK). In numbered paragraphs 11-13, pages 9-12 of the final Office Action, claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over the Examiner's cited Ecolore screen shots and source codes: glossaries.xml, glossaries_en.xml, glossaries_el.xml, glossaries.xml?lang=en, glossaries.xml?lang=el; source: July 2003 WaybackMachine printouts of Ecolore website "ecolore.leeds.ac.uk/xml/links/glossaries.xml"; in view of JP 2001-290812

(GK Associates KK) and further in view of US 2003/0037076 (Bravery et al.). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant has previously discussed of record a data display system including a client computer and a server connected through a network. There, Applicant has discussed of record a browser device of the client computer identifying the style definition file, checking contents of the data definition file of the second type and selecting one of the data definition files of the first type and downloading the same to the client computer; and a display displaying data on the client computer using the files downloaded by the browser device from said first, second and third memories, as exemplified in Fig. 9. Further, Applicant has disclosed that when English has been selected as the display language as shown in FIG. 7, XML1 (English.xml) is automatically applied (see, XSLT of FIG. 8), and "(1) English display" of FIG. 10 is displayed on the screen by the browser (e.g., paragraph [0082]).

As further disclosed by the Applicant, when the display language is changed to Japanese, "2" is set in the <Set> tag of XML3, and display is switched to Japanese display using XML2 (Japanese.xml) and "(2) Japanese display" of FIG. 10 is displayed on the screen by the browser, without the necessity of changing XSLT (e.g., paragraph [0083]). Therefore, when the display language is changed from English to Japanese, the file that is newly downloaded is XML2 only, as exemplified in Fig. 10 (e.g., paragraph [0084] in Applicants' specification). Thus, the amount of data to be transmitted can be reduced.

The applied references, considered individually or in combination, would not have taught or suggested at least, among other recited features, when the contents of data to be displayed are updated, the browser device newly downloads only one

of the data definition files of the first type and updates the contents of data to be displayed, thereby the display on the client computer being switchable from one display data of one language to another display data of another language without the necessity of changing the style definition file, as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 7, 11 and 14.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner continues to assert that "Ecolore illustrates a display displaying data on the client computer using the files stored in said first, second and third memories, since the data that is displayed to the client is the webpage of glossaries.xml?lang=en, which is glossaries.xml with the content of glossaries_en.xml rendered by an XSLT." Applicant has of record traversed these Examiner's assertions. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that even if the Ecolore xml rendering is somehow construed to map to Applicants' files from the first, second and third memories, the Ecolore citation would not have taught or suggested at least Applicants' claimed feature of "when the contents of data to be displayed are updated, the browser device newly downloads only one of the data definition files of the first type and updates the contents of data to be displayed, thereby the display on the client computer being switchable from one display data of one language to another display data of another language without the necessity of changing the style definition file," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 7, 11 and 14. The Examiner admits at page 6 that "Ecolore does not explicitly teach, word for word, server and browser device."

The JP2001290812 (GK Associates) does not cure the deficiencies of the Ecolore citation. While the passage of the GK Associates publication, as relied upon by the Examiner, relates to a control method to extract a template file containing

format data, and extract contents file, it appears the extraction is for management of documents with a form, such as the Ichitaro document of JUST System, a word document of Microsoft Corp., and an Adobe Acrobat document of Adobe. (Paragraph [0025] of GK Associates) The GK Associates document is devoid of any teach or suggestion of displaying data on a client computer using files downloaded by a browser device from the first, second and third memories of a server connected through a network, as Applicants have claimed. Further, the GK Associates publication, individually or in combination with the Ecolore citation, would not have taught or suggested at least Applicants' claimed feature of "when the contents of data to be displayed are updated, the browser device newly downloads only one of the data definition files of the first type and updates the contents of data to be displayed, thereby the display on the client computer being switchable from one display data of one language to another display data of another language without the necessity of changing the style definition file," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 7, 11 and 14.

The Bravery et al. publication does not cure the deficiencies of the Ecolore citation and JP2001290812 (GK Associates). Rather, the Bravery et al. publication was applied by the Examiner in combination with the Ecolore citation and the GK Associates publication to reject dependent claims 5 and 6. The passage of the Bravery et al. publication, as relied upon by the Examiner, merely recites a method of generating a style sheet for applying presentation characteristics to Web page content, wherein referenced style sheet components include style sheet commands for applying presentation characteristics to dynamic data retrieved from a Web server. This in itself would not have inferred displaying data on a client computer

using the files downloaded by the browser device from the first, second and third memories as Applicants have claimed. Further, the Bravery et al. publication, individually or in combination with the Ecolore citation and the GK Associates publication, would not have taught or suggested at least Applicants' claimed feature of "when the contents of data to be displayed are updated, the browser device newly downloads only one of the data definition files of the first type and updates the contents of data to be displayed, thereby the display on the client computer being switchable from one display data of one language to another display data of another language without the necessity of changing the style definition file," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 7, 11 and 14.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant's claims 1, 7, 11 and 14 are allowable. The remaining dependent claims recite additional advantageous features which further distinguish over the documents relied upon by the Examiner. As such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: June 27, 2008   By: _____

Richard J. Kim
Registration No. 48360

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620